



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,852	11/19/2001	Donald Allison	ALSN-1-1001	1245

25315 7590 01/21/2003

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM  
816 SECOND AVE.  
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER
----------

THOMAS, ALEXANDER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1772

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,852

Applicant(s)

ALLISON, DONALD

Examiner

Alexander S. Thomas

Art Unit

1772

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: .

Art Unit: 1772

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's acknowledged state of the art in view of Sizemore. The primary reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed; see page 1, lines 16-28. However it does not disclose lines of perforations on the tape or the claimed size of tape.

Sizemore discloses a tape with lines of perforations thereon to provide removable sections of tape. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide lines of perforations on the tape of the primary reference in view of Sizemore to provide a tape wherein measured sections of tape can be readily removed.

3. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's acknowledged state of the art as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of either Cohausz or Perri. Cohausz and Perri each disclose the use of elongated slits on the edges of tapes to aid in tearing the tapes; see column 4, lines 24-27 of Perri and the Abstract of Cohausz. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use elongated slits at the edges of the tape of Sizemore in view of the teachings in the secondary references to facilitate tearing off of a section of tape. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the size of the tape and removable sections depending on the end use of the masking tape.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sizemore. See column 2, lines 12-27.

6. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sizemore in view of Cohausz or Perri. The primary reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed; see column 2, lines 12-27. However it does not disclose elongated slits at the edges and the claimed size of the tape. The secondary references each disclose the use of elongated slits on the edges of tapes to aid in tearing the tapes; see column 4, lines 24-27 of Perri and the Abstract of Cohausz. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use elongated slits at the edges of the tape of Sizemore in view of the teachings in the secondary references to facilitate tearing off of a section of tape. It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the size of the tape and removable sections depending on the end use of the masking tape.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander S. Thomas whose telephone number is 703-308-2421. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-3:00.

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 703-308-4251. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-5408 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Alexander S. Thomas". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

ALEXANDER S. THOMAS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER